

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE CULPEPER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD ROOM, LOCATED AT 302 N. MAIN STREET, ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2006.

**Board Members Present:**     **John F. Coates, Chairman**  
   **Steven E. Nixon, Vice-Chairman**  
Larry W. Aylor  
William C. Chase, Jr.  
Sue D. Hansohn  
Brad C. Rosenberger  
Steven L. Walker

**Staff Present:**                     Frank T. Bossio, County Administrator  
J. David Maddox, County Attorney  
Valerie H. Lamb, Finance Director  
John C. Egertson, Planning Director  
Paul Howard, Director of Environmental Services  
Peggy S. Crane, Deputy Clerk

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Coates, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

Mrs. Hansohn led the Board and audience in the Pledge Allegiance to the Flag.

**RE: APPROVAL OF AGENDA - ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS**

Mr. Bossio asked that the following items be added under **NEW BUSINESS:**  
**DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE MUSEUM OF CULPEPER HISTORY;** and  
**CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION FOR FIRE STATION CONSTRUCTION PROJECT.**

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve the agenda as amended.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

**RE: MINUTES**

The minutes of the December 6, 2005 and January 3, 2006 regular minutes were presented to the Board for consideration.

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mrs. Hanson, to approve the minutes as presented.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Abstain - Aylor

Motion carried 6 to 0, with one abstention.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Bossio reviewed the following Consent Agenda items with the Board:

- a. The Board will consider approving a budget transfer for the purchase of an additional telephone card, lines, port and voice recognition for the C.A.N.S. (Culpeper Automated Notification System) in the amount of \$12,000.
- b. The Board will consider approving budget amendments for the Department of Human Services for additional funds in the areas of: Head Start Grant in the amount of \$9,528 and various public assistance programs in the amount of \$24,200, for a grand total of \$33,728.
- c. The Board will consider approving a budget transfer for the relocation of fiber that was run to the E-911 Center in the amount of \$30,000.
- d. The Board will consider approving a proclamation in concert with the State of Virginia declaring April 2006 as Southern Heritage Month.

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Mr. Chase inquired whether the C.A.N.S. was completely operational because he had experienced some difficulty in receiving calls. Mr. Bossio said the system was operating properly, but he would follow up to be sure.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

### **GENERAL COUNTY BUSINESS**

#### **PRESENTATION OF SERVICE AWARDS**

Mr. Coates announced that the Board would recognize County employees with 5, 10, 15, and 25 years of service. Mr. Bossio read the names of the employees receiving awards and presented certificates to those in attendance. Mr. Coates thanked the employees on behalf of the Board for their many contributions to the County.

Mr. Coates recessed the meeting at 10:25 a.m. to allow Board members and others who were interested to view the new Mobile Command Center parked in the County lot.

Mr. Coates called the meeting back to order at 10:40 a.m.

#### **COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT FOR YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2005**

Mr. David Hughes, Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, thanked the County's Finance Department, the Treasurer's Office, and the School Board for their assistance in preparing the

County's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Year Ended June 30, 2005. He explained that the report was divided into four sections: Introductory, Financial, Statistical, and Compliance. He noted the three opinions on the basic financial statements, compliance with laws and regulations, and Federal assistance programs were "unqualified", the cleanest opinions that could be given. He also noted that there were no findings or questions regarding the County's expenditures of Federal funds. He said the reports had been submitted to the Government Finance Officers Association and he anticipated the County would receive an award for excellence in financial reporting as it had for the past several years.

Mr. Hughes reported there would be new changes required next year in statistical data and would require additional work. He also reported there were a few minor findings and recommendations for improvements in internal controls, which would be corrected by the end of the year.

Mr. Walker referenced page 81, School Board special revenue funds, which indicated a \$2.9 million negative budget. He said these were Federal reimbursement funds and asked for clarification. Mr. Hughes referred to page 72 which contained a synopsis of all school operating monies and explained that the Federal revenues were \$2,886,877, but the school operating budget was \$2,520,415, or \$366,462 more dollars were received than what were budgeted. He added that the total School Board budget was \$52,691,372, but expenditures were \$49,626,385, which \$3 million was transferred to the County.

Mr. Walker asked Mr. Hughes to explain the new Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 45 requirement. Mr. Hughes replied that GASB 45 would be effective for Culpeper County in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2009. He explained that the change would require the County to estimate the future value of non-pension benefits, such health care for its retirees, separately from current employee benefits in the budget.

Mr. Bossio noted that the intention was to implement this requirement at least one or two years early as had been done previously for other GASB changes. He said that would allow time for the data to settle before incorporating it into the system.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mrs. Hansohn, to accept the audit report.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

Mr. Coates acknowledged and welcomed several former Supervisors, Councilmen, School Board members, Constitutional Officers who were in the audience.

### **PRESENTATION BY MOSELEY ARCHITECTS**

Mr. Bossio informed the Board that the General Assembly had approved a study at its last session regarding the feasibility of a new County jail and that study done by Moseley Architects was nearing completion. He introduced Mr. Cary Gill and Mr. Ed Powell of Moseley Architects and asked them to report on the results of the study.

Mr. Gill explained that the State process for obtaining an exemption to the moratorium required that the County prepare a Community Based Corrections Plan and a planning study. He said that Mr. Powell would discuss the Community Based Corrections Plan, and he would talk about the planning study. Both studies are due to the Department of Corrections on March 1, in order to begin the review process required by the State.

Mr. Powell stated that the current jail, with a capacity of 37 beds, was adequate when originally built, but since that time the population in Culpeper had grown significantly with the result of an increase in arrests and confinements. He noted that the County had been housing inmates in other jurisdictions for the past two years when the jail population exceeded 90. He said, according to the State's forecasting models, it was projected that the County jail would need capacity for approximately 204 inmates by 2020, and should allow for expansion beyond number to meet future needs.

Mr. Gill reported that he and County staff had been in discussions with the State regarding the possibility of locating a jail on the Department of Corrections' Coffeewood site and all parties, including the Director of the Department of Corrections, had been receptive to the idea. He said the State was anticipating that Culpeper County would provide some upgrades in the infrastructure or utilities at its facility in exchange for a 30-acre parcel on the north end of the Coffeewood property. He noted this location would separate the County facility from the adult and juvenile facilities. He estimated that 204 inmates would require a 80,000 square-foot facility based on State standards. He indicated the location of the areas for public entrances, intake and booking, a warehouse and central plant, with educational components, medical facilities, and a parking area that would allow for expansion in the future.

Mr. Gill stated that the projected cost based on Department of Corrections formulas would be approximately \$25 million in today's dollars – \$21 million for the 89,000 square-foot building and \$4.4 for soft costs such as engineering fees, surveys and testing, furniture, etc., He added that projecting out to the spring of 2009, using a 7 percent inflation figure, the cost would be approximately \$30 million – \$25 million for the jail and \$5 million for soft costs. He pointed out that by going through this process, the County would be eligible to receive 25 percent of the

total cost from the State, which would be \$7.5 million State money. He noted the County's costs would increase with its participation in the water/sewer costs.

Mr. Gill pointed out that if the March 1 date was not met, the exemption to the moratorium would be lost and the process would have to begin again. He said the State would review the Community Based Corrections Plan and planning study this summer and then send it to the State Board of Corrections in November for approval prior to submission for inclusion in the State budget. He anticipated that after the Governor signed off on next year's budget in March 2008, construction could begin that spring and inmates could be moved in by the summer of 2010.

Mrs. Hansohn asked whether there would be increased funding from the State if other localities joined with Culpeper County. Mr. Gill replied that if a regional jail were created with three or more localities, it would be eligible for up to 50 percent of the construction costs. He noted that the County had approached six or seven adjacent counties and none were interested in joining the effort.

Mr. Nixon questioned the cost per square foot for the new jail. Mr. Gill informed him that the State's 2006 *Construction Cost Index* set the cost at \$216 per square foot for 2008, and using a 7 percent inflation factor, the cost would be close to the projected \$240 per square foot. Mr. Nixon stated that based on a \$30 million price tag for 89,000 square feet, the cost per square foot would be \$337. Mr. Gill explained that \$240 per square foot was for the base building construction, and site development, roads, utilities, and access would add another 10 to 15 percent.

Mr. Nixon noted that land costs were not included. Mr. Gill agreed there would be no land costs if negotiations were successful with the State, but the County would be obligated to participate in the cost to upgrade the utilities.

Mr. Walker asked whether the County's additional utilities costs could be included in the total amount the State could reimburse at 25 percent. Mr. Gill replied that would have to be negotiated and discussed with the State, who may take the position that the County should pay something in exchange for the land.

Mr. Walker asked whether there was a possibility of housing some juveniles in the new jail. He noted that the juvenile space was not currently being utilized and the potential was there to turn it into an adult facility. Mr. Gill pointed out that the juvenile facility was not operated by the Department of Corrections since it was a Department of Juvenile Services's facility and not the concern of the Department of Corrections. He stated that juveniles could be housed in

the jail if they were separated physically from the adult population, but they could use the same food, medical and educational services.

Mr. Bossio stated that several years ago, the County had talked to the Department of Juvenile Justice regarding the possibility of housing juveniles in the adult facility, and at that time they did not have a firm understanding of what the sight/sound separation requirements were. He said they had later determined that with sight/sound separation that capability did exist. He said the concern now was whether it would be cost effective with only three or four juveniles per month.

Mr. Nixon asked whether the Moseley study contemplated the use of the existing jail should a new facility be constructed. Mr. Gill replied that issue was not a part of the study.

Mr. Coates pointed out that the County had not draw down approximately \$800,000 from the State when the current jail was expanded and those funds were reappropriated. He said he hoped that the Department of Corrections would consider that the County had a previous credit not received.

Mr. Coates thanked Mr. Gill and Mr. Powell for their presentation.

#### **REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT FOR LIVESTOCK KILLED BY DOGS**

Animal Control Officer Robert Hornung informed the Board that on December 13, he received a call from Linda Catlett, River Hill Farm, regarding a cow that was killed by dogs. He said he investigated and found signs that dogs had killed the cow. He stated when he returned to the scene later with a dog trap, he saw dogs from a distance eating the cow. He indicated he had been unable to catch the dogs and, ten days later, a dead newborn calf had been consumed by dogs, but he could not determine whether it had been killed by them.

Mrs. Hansohn asked how money was involved in the request. Mr. Hornung stated that the County had a \$400 limit on an adult cow, and he was not sure what the estimate was for a calf.

Mr. David Maddox, County Attorney, stated that the applicant had submitted several letters and documents that were sufficient to justify the claim, and in her second communication she stated that a bull calf raised to normal selling time would sell in the \$450 to \$650 range. He pointed out that the State statute placed a \$400 limit on reimbursement of livestock killed by dogs.

Mr. Chase questioned whether the County was reimbursing for the present value or grown-out value.

Ms. Jamie Bennett, Director of Animal Services, replied that it was the intent of the State

to reimburse the immediate value of the animal, and not the prospective value.

Mr. Maddox added that the statute states "... shall not be entitled to receive as compensation the fair market value of such livestock"; therefore, it should be the present value as indicated.

Mr. Rosenberger estimated that the value of the calf would be between \$100 and \$125 if sold as a veal calf.

Mr. Chase moved, seconded by Mrs. Hansohn, to reimburse \$400 for the cow and \$125 for the calf for a total of \$525.

Mr. Coates stated that the Board realized the cow and calf were worth more than the reimbursement, but the County was limited by State statute on the amount it could reimburse.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

#### **DISCUSSION OF RESOLUTION TO APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR THE NEW HIGH SCHOOL**

Mr. Bossio informed the Board that bids received for building the new high school were slightly over slightly over \$47 million. He said the School Board and the School Oversight Committee (SOC) had studied the options and bid alternatives to delete the auditorium and reduce the contract by \$3,145,000; delete the athletic facility and reduce the contract by \$3,116,000; and/or delete the completion of 12 classrooms and reduce the contract by \$750,000. He said the result of that review was now before the Board in the form of a resolution from the School Board that recommended awarding the contract to Shockey Company for \$47,139,000, less and except any adjustments that reflect further value improvements identified by the Culpeper County School Board staff in cooperation with the proposed contractor. He said the Board would need to hold a public hearing in order to appropriate the funds, and he was asking for authority to advertise for appropriation of those funds in March. He asked the Board to keep in mind that the School Board would award the contract on February 20, in order to keep the contract valid. He noted that there was \$53 million in that budget and the School Board intended to spend \$47,139,000 of that for the new school.

Mr. Chase asked for additional information on the brick being considered for the new school. He said one of his constituents informed him that the proposed brick was three times the normal size and cost \$1.65 per brick. He stated that the same space could be filled with three regular bricks at 25 cents per brick and cost \$165,000 less.

Mr. Hunter Spencer, Project Manager, stated that the bricks in the bid were

manufactured by Endicott, but he would be asking several other manufacturers to submit samples of brick with their costs. He said he would definitely review the differences in cost.

Mr. Chase asked whether the bricks were chosen because of their color. Mr. Spencer replied that no brick would be turned down because of its color, but the color of the brick would have to be compatible with the metal panels on the exterior of the building. He agreed that brick was an area where costs could be curtailed and pointed out that at the present time there was in excess of \$700,000 of potential credits that could be realized by making some specification changes.

Mr. Chase asked about liquidated damages. Mr. Spencer replied that liquidated damages under the contract were \$3,000 per day for a short period of time, then that would increase. He said that approximately 26 months of construction was more than ample time for building a steel frame building.

Mr. Walker asked whether the School Board and SOC were looking for additional cuts in order to stay within the \$53 million total budget, which designated \$42 million for the building and \$11 million for soft costs. Mr. Spencer replied that he could not commit to staying within the \$53 million total budget.

Mr. Walker stated that the School Board had committed to stay within the \$53 million budget for the entire project.

Mr. Spencer stated he would continue to look for cost savings during the entire building project. He noted that the percentage of soft costs based on the \$47 million building was approximately 19 percent, which was low compared to the State average.

Mrs. Hansohn moved, seconded by Mr. Aylor, to advertise for a public hearing at the Board's March meeting for the appropriation of \$47,139,000.

Mr. Walker asked how cost savings would be worked into the appropriation. Mr. Maddox replied that the Board would make an appropriation covering the bid and make adjustments later as the project moved forward. Mr. Bossio suggested that the Board appropriate the dollars and any cost savings would be documented and rolled over into the soft costs as needed.

Mr. Nixon asked that the motion be restated.

Mrs. Hansohn repeated her motion to advertise for public hearing at the Board's March meeting for an appropriation of \$47,139,000 for the construction costs for the new school.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.



Mr. Coates recessed the meeting at 11:37 a.m.

Mr. Coates called the meeting back to order at 11:50 a.m.

Mr. Coates stated he would like to rearrange the agenda to accommodate the participants' schedules and consider under **NEW BUSINESS** the **DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE MUSEUM OF CULPEPER HISTORY** and **CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION FOR FIRE STATION CONSTRUCTION PROJECT**. There were no objections.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE MUSEUM OF CULPEPER HISTORY**

Mrs. Carolyn Smith, President of the Museum's Board of Directors, thanked the Board for the opportunity to discuss plans for the Museum. She said she would endeavor to answer any questions regarding the financial status of the Museum in the absence of Mrs. Elizabeth O'Reilly, who was not present because her child was ill. She introduced Mrs. Elizabeth Wilson, a Board member, who would talk about the future plans for the Museum.

Mrs. Smith presented a copy of the Museum's Profit and Loss Statements for the last three years and indicated the Museum had been operating in the red during that period and had been forced to draw money from a capital campaign account which was now depleted. She said it cost approximately \$9,500 per month to operate the Museum, and its Board could not meet that budget. She noted that in order to save the Museum, it would be necessary to cut expenses and add revenues. She said it was strictly a financial decision to remove the position of Executive Director from the budget, which saved more than \$4,000 per month, but \$5,000 additional would be needed per month to stay in business. She stated that a fund-raiser in the fall raised approximately \$25,000, and another was planned for the spring, but the Museum was the point of needing immediate assistance. She asked the Board to consider allocating an additional \$10,000 to the Museum to carry it through the fiscal year.

Mrs. Hansohn asked whether the Town had agreed to forego the rent for the balance of this year. Mrs. Smith replied that a Town's Committee had approved a recommendation to the Town Council to waive the rent and utilities for the balance of the fiscal year, and she was anticipating that the Town Council would approve.

Mr. Chase expressed his concerns regarding management. He said within the last few years, funds had been raised for a college scholarship, which had never been established. Mrs. Smith stated she was not aware of a scholarship, but she would check on that.

Mr. Chase stated that several former Board Directors had received letters from the Museum informing them their services were no longer needed. Mrs. Smith said she was

unaware of that, but several Directors were removed in the past for nonattendance. She said there were seven Board members when the decision was made to eliminate the Executive Director position, after that two Board members resigned for personal reason, and four of the five remaining Board members' terms expired December 31. She said the four members agreed to stay on until April in order to protect the integrity of the Museum.

Mr. Chase asked for copies of the Museum's financial statements for the last three years so he could review them because he was concerned since public funds were involved. Mrs. Smith stated that she felt the same concern for public funds, and the Museum had a CPA who filed their taxes each year. She also stated that approximately a year and a half ago, an audit was done by two citizen Finance Committee members and no mishandling of funds had been discovered.

Mr. Chase pointed out that he received a quarterly newsletter from the Brandy Station Foundation, which contained a financial statement, and he had suggested to Mr. Bossio that the Museum consider issuing the same type of newsletter.

Mr. Chase asked what the management procedure was for workers receiving raises. Mrs. Smith stated that no raises were given last year. She said they now had one full-time person who worked 30-35 hours per week, and Board members and other volunteers filled in as necessary.

Mr. Nixon asked what was the amount the Town Committee would recommend be waived. Mrs. Smith replied the request was for \$800 per month be waived – \$400 per month for rent and \$400 for utilities.

Mr. Nixon asked whether a similar donation of \$800 per month from the Board would help in the short term. Mrs. Smith replied that would not be sufficient since it would take in excess of \$20,000 to finish out the year, and she was counting on volunteers raising an additional \$10,000 to match the request to the County for \$10,000.

Mr. Coates stated he was a former member of the Museum Board, and he personally would like to see the doors kept open.

Mrs. Hansohn agreed that she would like to keep the doors open, and she would like to hear more about the future plans of the Museum before the Board made a decision.

Mrs. Wilson stated she became a member of the Museum Board in January 2005, and she was tremendously impressed with the activities and displays of the Museum. She said the draft plan of action was before the Board, and she would review it briefly. She said the Museum Board had been trying to address some of Mr. Chase's concerns of inclusiveness and insularity,

and the Board would be working to make the Museum an integral part of the community and to ensure everyone had an interest in the organization. She listed the following actions being taken:

- Send a letter to both the Town and County inviting them to review the Museum's financial records in order to dispel any question regarding inappropriate use of funds.
- Invite both the Town and County to appoint a representative to serve on the Board (voting or nonvoting to be determined).
- Fill at least a couple more Board positions.
- Be more realistic in setting budgets in the future.
- Create an advisory board to the Board of Directors to draw additional input and collaboration from the community. The advisory board would include representatives from the School System, Germanna Community College, County Library, and other historical organizations.
- Undertake fund-raising.
- Followup on a request to the Commonwealth of Virginia for a grant of \$100,000 – \$50,000 per year for two years (previously submitted by the former Executive Director).
- Request additional funds from both the Town and County in next year's appropriation
- Establish both an acquisition fund and a capital fund separate from the operating budget to cover dollars donated for specific purposes.
- Make renewal of *Friends of the Museum* on January 1, instead of on the anniversary date of when membership began. Cost currently \$20 to become a *Friend*.
- Reinstitute the newsletter and include a financial statement as suggested.
- Develop a long-range staffing plan to increase reliance on pro bono and volunteer workers and, eventually, hire a part-time administrator to be paid \$18 to \$20 per hour up to 16 hours per week.

Mr. Chase asked whether there was an all-inclusive inventory of items in the Museum. Mrs. Smith replied that the files contained a listing of all the items that had been donated to the Museum, either on loan or as a gift, but she was not sure if it was an all-inclusive list. Mr. Chase said he felt it would be required for insurance purposes. Mrs. Wilson stated she would add that item to the draft plan of action.

Mr. Walker stated that he noticed the Department of Tourism had not been included on the advisory board. Mrs. Wilson explained that it had not been included because a representative from that Department was one of the possibilities for Town membership on the

advisory board. She added that the Museum was already coordinating events with the Tourism Department, and would ensure that a representative from the Museum would attend that Department's meetings.

Mrs. Hansohn complimented the Museum upon its draft plan of action.

Mrs. Hansohn moved, seconded by Mr. Nixon, to grant \$10,000 to the Museum and that the Board maintain a close relationship with the Museum to assist it in becoming more successful.

Mr. Nixon stated that he would support the motion because the Museum was a valuable asset to the Town and County, not only in terms of history, but for the tourism dollars it brings. He commended the Museum for its efforts in developing a plan of action and stated the County's contribution for next year would be considered during the budget cycle.

Mr. Chase agreed that the Museum was an asset to the community, but he was expressing his concern regarding the spending of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Rosenberger stated he had never met anyone who had visited the Museum, whether a resident or a visitor, who had not been tremendously impressed. He stressed that the Museum was particularly important since the State was recognizing April as Southern Heritage Month and the Jamestown 2007 Celebration in the near future. He said he would support the motion.

Mr. Chase stated he would support the motion, but he would like to see the financial statements before considering next year's budget.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION FOR FIRE STATION CONSTRUCTION PROJECT**

Mr. Bossio informed the Board that a resolution was being presented for approval that would enable the Salem Fire Department under a specific Internal Revenue Code to ask for a \$2.5 million loan. He noted that the Volunteer Fire Departments fell under the extended umbrella of the County even though there was no direct relationship between them. The purpose of the resolution was to enable the Salem Volunteer Fire Department to obtain financing at a reduced rate from BB&T. He noted that the Salem Volunteer Fire Department would have to obtain the loan prior to December 31, 2006 in order not to affect the County's ability to obtain bank qualified financing. He stated that should not be a problem since the Salem Company had assured him its loan would be drawn down prior to that time. He said that

the following caveat had been added to the resolution: "4. The approval under this Resolution shall be of no force or effect after December 31, 2006."

Mr. Maddox pointed out that the qualification period was the calendar year rather than the fiscal year.

Mr. Chase moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve the resolution.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

**GENERAL COUNTY BUSINESS** (Continued)

**CONSIDERATION OF REIMBURSEMENT FOR TIPPING FEES**

Mr. Paul Howard, Environmental Services Director, informed the Board that Habitat for Humanity had requested reimbursement in the amount of \$952.27 for tipping fees paid at the Culpeper County transfer station for debris removed from a house that burned down on Griffinsburg Road. He noted that the fees had been paid by D&M Container Service, who had been reimbursed by Habitat for Humanity.

Mr. Chase moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve reimbursement to the Habitat for Humanity for tipping fees paid in the amount of \$952.27.

Mr. Coates asked whether there was insurance on the house. Mr. Howard replied that he did not know. Mr. Coates stated he would support the motion but asked Mr. Howard to determine insurance coverage prior to future requests for reimbursement of tipping fees.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

Mr. Coates recessed the meeting for lunch at 12:35 p.m.

Mr. Coates called the meeting back to order at 2:00 p.m.

**UPDATE ON THE COMMUNITY COMPLEX**

Mr. John Barrett, Parks and Recreation Director, updated the Board on the Community Complex, and took them on a virtual tour beginning with pictures of the left-hand turn off Route 666 into Jonas Road and followed by views of the soccer fields and new fencing along Jonas Road to provide additional safety and eliminate some of the damage to the ball fields. He indicated the area where a pond would be fenced in, the entrance off Jonas Road into the Complex, and the front gates which were now being locked and opened by staff. He displayed pictures of the ballfields, fencing purchased by the Foundation, the winter blanket placed over

the infield to deter vegetation growth and encourage the growth of the Bermuda grass, as well as other photos of the facility and fencing, the senior field, the parking area supporting the football fields, the bridges from the front of the parking lot feeding into the soccer field area. He concluded the tour by indicating the location for the concession stand, activity area, and possibly the inclusion of horseshoe pits.

Mr. Barrett reported that he had met with Steve Hosteller from Timmons, who would be updating the actual site plan and the amenities to support the Complex. He said he had also met with Ben Tissue regarding landscaping, and the Foundation would be meeting with the School Board regarding scoreboards to be installed prior to April 1.

Mr. Chase questioned Mr. Barrett about the newspaper ad for a manager at the Complex and asked why a college degree was required for this type of work.

Mr. Bossio explained that the position had been approved by the Board as part of last year's budget year, and Mr. Barrett had advertised, received applications, and was ready to begin interviewing the candidates.

Mr. Barrett stated that the full-time employee would be responsible for the entire turf maintenance procedure, as well as managing the Complex and scheduling the use of the fields. He said the employee would be actively involved with the 27 acres at Spilman Park, the 256 acres at Laurel Valley, and the nine acres behind the A. G. Richardson Building.

Mr. Chase and Mr. Barrett had an extended discussion regarding the need for a full-time position versus a part-time position, as well as the requirement for a college degree.

Mr. Aylor asked whether the potential employee would need a license to apply chemicals to the fields. Mr. Barrett stated that a license would be required, and a college graduate in this area of expertise would already be licensed.

Mr. Walker asked for an update on a swimming pool in the Complex.

Mr. Barrett stated he and Mr. Bossio had walked the area being considered for the swimming pool, and later Mr. Hosteller measured the area and determined it was approximately one acre, which could accommodate a 59,000-square foot building. He said that Mr. Hosteller was preparing a drawing to show the facility with a family pool, 25-50 meter pool, basketball courts, meeting rooms, a senior citizen gathering place that could be reverted back into an area to rent to various groups, offices space and a locker room area. He said that Mr. Hosteller was suggesting a two-story building that would be ADA accessible.

Mr. Walker asked for an estimate of the size of the building site so the Town could be made aware of the dimensions. Mr. Barrett informed him the site would be at least 400 feet by 700 feet.

Mr. Nixon pointed out that the County had never notified the Town that the property was available for a swimming pool, and the next step would be to advise the Town Council if the Board wanted to proceed.

There was a general discussion among the Board regarding the amenities that could be provided in the space available in order to make the building a multi-use facility in addition to just a pool house.

Mrs. Hansohn wanted confirmation that should the acre be offered to the Town, they would build the entire project and operate it. Mr. Barrett assured her that it was entirely a Town project.

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to send a letter to the Town confirming that the County would make a space available to them for the community pool if they chose to locate it at the Sports Complex.

Mr. Walker suggested that Mr. Nixon amend the motion to include that the space was roughly 700 x 400 square feet. Mr. Nixon stated that information would be provided when exact dimensions were available.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

Mr. Chase moved that the position advertised for the Complex be a part-time job in the beginning and not a full-time position to start. Mr. Nixon seconded for discussion purposes.

Mr. Chase stated that he would like to save County money because the position would not be full time in the beginning. He asked Mr. Barrett to clarify the job functions. Mr. Barrett repeated the functions stated previously and explained the technical knowledge that would be required for turf management. He said that a full-time employee would acquire a sense of ownership of the Complex and the County parks and would protect the County's investments. He noted that in the winter time when outdoor activities were curtailed, there was a possibility that the full-time employee could participate in some of the activities of the Environment Services Department. He said he had discussed this with Mr. Howard and he had agreed to that arrangement.

Mrs. Hansohn asked what type of degree was being sought. Mr. Barrett replied that a

degree in horticulture, turf maintenance and management, agriculture, or parks and recreation were possibilities.

The Board members discussed at length the need for a full-time position versus a part-time position in relation to the various duties required with a salary level of \$40,000 to \$50,000 for a full-time person with a degree.

Mr. Coates asked whether the position would have to be readvertised if the motion on the floor passed. Mr. Barrett replied that it would have to be readvertised.

Mr. Walker asked whether Mr. Barrett had a sufficient pool of applicants from which to interview. Mr. Barrett stated that he did.

Mr. Walker suggested that Mr. Barrett negotiate with the applicants and see if they would accept a part-time position in the beginning.

Mr. Coates pointed out that if the job description were changed in any way, the position would have to be readvertised. He asked for the County Attorney's comments.

Mr. Maddox stated he would recommend one of two options: (1) Continue with a full-time position as advertised, and proceed with the interview and hiring process, or (2) cancel the whole process and start anew. He said that the job qualifications should not be changed after being advertised.

Mr. Coates pointed out that the Board had discussed the motion extensively and had received a legal opinion.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Chase

Nays - Aylor, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion failed 6 to 1.

Mr. Coates asked Mr. Barrett to keep the Board's concerns in mind as he proceeds.

**CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING FOR NEW HIGH RESOLUTION AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY  
AND 2 FOOT CONTOUR TOPOGRAPHY**

Mr. Egertson informed the Board that he was requesting funds to acquire high resolution aerial photography and two-foot contour topography for the County GIS System. He explained that the Virginia Geographic Information Network (VGIN) had previously flown the entire State and provided each locality in the State with aerial photography. He said that photography was obtained in 2002, integrated into the County GIS system in 2003, and was available both in-house and on the County's web site. He explained that VGIN would be flying the entire State this spring and had offered a menu of options to the localities. He noted that the new



photography would be free of charge, but the photography could be provided in a much higher resolution at a scale of 100 rather than a scale of 200 at a cost of \$71,380. He pointed out that the higher resolution photography would be helpful to the Planning Office in investigation and verification of zoning violations, tax mapping, ensuring accuracy in placing roads and property lines, and in placing the buildings in E-911 mapping. He stated that the second option was available only if the higher resolution photography were purchased and that option was obtaining digital two-foot contour topography for the entire County, after the higher resolution photography was flown and finished, at an additional cost of \$78,727. He said the total for both would be \$150,107.

Mr. Egertson pointed out that the County was currently using U. S. Geological Survey maps that were 20-foot contours and the two-foot contours would be useful in all aspects of planning and development, at the engineering-type level, and in water and sewer planning and design. He said the cost would be quickly recovered in cost savings. He explained that the County had paid \$10,500 for two-foot contour information for the sports complex, \$13,000 for the new jail at Coffeewood, and \$21,000 for water/sewer planning in the Mountain Run Watershed. He added that Mr. Howard had been involved in many of these projects, including contours around the landfill area, and he could vouch that the County would be spending funds for future two-foot contours. He added that the money did not have to be paid until the products were delivered – the photography in the summer, and the topography as much as a year later. He suggested that if the Board approved committing the funds, that they be taken from the Board's General Fund and put into an appropriate account until the expenditures were made.

Mr. Chase asked whether landowners could purchase the topographic maps. Mr. Egertson replied that both the photography and topography were being provided by VGIN for government use only. He said the County would have to sign an agreement stating the products would not be sold or used by anybody except the County, but the information could be viewed on the GIS system.

Mr. Nixon asked whether there were any projects upcoming before the new photography and topography would be available. Mr. Egertson replied that there would probably be some water and sewer projects, but he felt there would be cost savings in the long-term development of the County.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Nixon, to budget the amount of \$150,107 from the General Fund to a line item appropriate to authorize the photography and the two-foot topography.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### **RULES COMMITTEE REPORT - JANUARY 10, 2006**

Mr. Walker reported that the Rules Committee met and had two items for the Board's consideration: (1) Recommending that the Industrial Development Authority bylaws be approved; and (2) recommending that the 2006 Rules of Procedures be approved with changes.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Nixon, to approve the bylaws for the Industrial Development Authority.

Mr. Maddox stated that during the Rules Committee discussion, he was asked whether the Board could amend the **Amendments of Bylaws** on page 7, from "a majority" of the Board of Directors to "a super majority" and his answer was yes, that change could be made if the Board of Supervisors so desired.

Mr. Walker stated he asked the question at the Rules Committee meeting because he felt it more appropriate to require a super majority when making changes to the bylaws.

Mr. Maddox stated that a number should be specified, and he recommended five of the seven as a super majority.

Mr. Walker amended his motion to approve the bylaws for the Industrial Development Authority with the change on page 7 stating a super majority of five of the seven members would be required to amend the bylaws.

Mr. Nixon asked whether the purpose for the amendment was to make it harder to change the bylaws. Mr. Walker stated he wanted to ensure that more thought was given to changing the bylaws and more Directors should agree with the amendments.

Mr. Nixon accepted the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Coates stated that he understood adding "super majority", but he would not support the motion because he felt more flexibility was needed.

Mr. Walker stated the members would still have flexibility, but a larger majority would have to be in favor of the bylaw changes. Mr. Nixon agreed and stated that adding one additional person was not a huge change.

Mr. Coates stated that the bylaws could always be amended. Mr. Maddox disagreed. He said the bylaws were a standard document developed by McGuire Woods for use by IDA's and the Board could not amend the bylaws once they were conveyed to the IDA.

Mrs. Hansohn stated she agreed with Mr. Walker and Mr. Nixon. She said it would not make it more difficult to change the bylaws, but would ensure that everyone be present at meetings when changes to the bylaws were being considered.

Mr. Nixon pointed out that the motion should specify the number of members present or the total members of the IDA.

Mr. Maddox agreed that the motion should be amended to require at least five members must vote to change the bylaws.

Mr. Walker amended the motion to require at least five members must be present and vote in the affirmative to change the bylaws. Mr. Nixon agreed to the amendment.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mrs. Hansohn, to approve the Rules of Procedure for 2006, to include the changes recommended by the County Attorney in January, as well as to include a reference to the adopted civility rules in item 2-8-B: "These rules are reflected in the County's Amended Policy of Civility in Public Services."

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Nay - Chase

Motion carried 6 to 1.

See Attachment #1 for details of meeting.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT - JANUARY 10, 2006**

Mrs. Hansohn reported that the Public Works Committee met with the Town's Water and Wastewater Committee on January 10, and Stanley Franklin of McGuire Woods was present and answered questions. She said three scenarios were identified for more intense study: (1) Form an authority requiring a voter referendum in order for the Town to join; (2) the Town would become a wholesale provider; and (3) both entities would go their separate ways. She said a second meeting was held on January 30, and Mr. Bossio would report on that since she was not present.

See Attachment #2 for details of meeting.

#### **JOINT MEETING WITH TOWN'S WATER AND WASTEWATER COMMITTEE MEETING – JANUARY 30, 2006**

Mr. Bossio reported that the Town's Water and Wastewater Committee and the County's Public Works Committee met January 30 and discussed the outcome of the staffing meeting between the Town and County staff held the week before. He said they tried to arrive at some conclusions about what each body needed to have before they could move forward with a joint agreement.

Mr. Bossio said that the Town felt that a boundary adjustment was absolutely necessary before the Town could join an authority in order to ensure the Town's future revenue and expansion; and the County felt the most important thing was the creation of a joint water and sewer authority. He said that the Town's concern was that the rate payers were accustomed to a current rate, and the Town wanted some rate payer protection while moving forward; and the County's concern was land use and what would happen to the land once the Town acquired it. He noted another big issue was revenue sharing because the Town could collect revenues for capital from meals taxes and other things, and the County could not at the present time. He said on the other hand, the County could get proffers for the land being developed and/or rezoned. The County wanted to protect the land affected by a boundary adjustment to the Town. He stated it was made clear that if the Town and County agreed on a boundary adjustment, it would have to be a concurrent action with the creation of a joint authority.

Mr. Bossio noted that the group discussed the authority and how it could be managed. He said the Town and County could enter into a contract to join the authority; the authority would then manage the County and Town assets, which could not be leased or disposed of; the Town would maintain ownership of the assets; and at some predetermined agreed upon date, the lines, customers, etc., would be turned over to the authority. A referendum would be required when the Town made a decision to transfer or dispose of the assets.

Mr. Bossio stated that the Town was running full speed to take its plant to 6 million gallons per day [MGD], and questions were voiced regarding the economics and feasibility of an authority – would it better to leave the Town at 4 MGD and build a new plant on Mountain Run, or go to 6 MGD at the Town plant and build a new plant at the opposite end of the County.

Mr. Bossio said that land use issues required further discussion, particularly agricultural; the need to balance revenue sharing; the adjustment of funding ratios because of growth within the Town; the methodology for school proffers as Culpeper County continued to grow; and how the Town's rate payers would be protected for a defined period of years. He said that the Town Council and Board of Supervisors would need to meet in mid-February to discuss how they

wanted to proceed. A first step would be to develop a memorandum of understanding to address the boundary line adjustment and the creation of an authority.

Mrs. Hansohn stated that the mid-February date was too soon to have a special meeting of the Town Council and Board of Supervisors to discuss the issues and vote. Mr. Bossio agreed that meeting in mid-February might be too aggressive, and he would work on constructing a more realistic time line. Mrs. Hansohn stressed that the Board needed to come to an agreement on the major issues before proceeding to the next step.

Mr. Chase expressed his strong opposition to the entire process and questioned the benefits of boundary line adjustments and a joint authority. He spoke at length regarding his concern with boundary line adjustments, the authority, land use, and revenue sharing. He felt that too much was being given away with too little being gained in return.

Mr. Coates acknowledged there were mixed views and they would have to be discussed at a future date in a work session.

Mrs. Hansohn agreed that Mr. Chase had raised some good points and they would need to be resolved before moving to the next step.

Mr. Coates thanked both the Town and County staffs for their work and setting forth items of concern. He asked Mrs. Hansohn whether the Public Works Committee would schedule a work session.

Mrs. Hansohn stated she was not sure how the meeting should be handled, but she would provide the Board members with some available dates.

Mr. Rosenberger agreed that the Board should have a work session to determine whether to continue to try to reach the goal of the two bodies to create a joint authority or whether to split and go their separate ways. He said he was concerned that the waste load allocation was the driving force and not the common good of all parties.

Mr. Walker stated he agreed with Mr. Chase regarding land use changes that may be made by the Town after boundary line adjustments were made and asked if there were legal ways to obligate the Town in terms of future land use. Mrs. Hansohn replied that issue was being researched.

Mr. Chase pointed out that the County had an independent authority, and the issue was whether the Town wanted to join it or not. Mrs. Hansohn agreed.

Mr. Rosenberger stated that consideration should be given to the fact that approximately 8,000 new houses would be needed for the County's authority to operate. Mr. Chase stated

that should not be a problem with the development along Route 29 business. Mrs. Hansohn added that the size of the authority was dependent on the number of roof tops to make it work.

See Attachment #3 for details of meeting.

**E-9-1-1 BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT - JANUARY 19, 2006**

Mrs. Hansohn reported that the E-911 Committee met and approved its FY 07 budget for transmittal to the County's Finance Office.

See Attachment #4 for details of meeting.

**TOWN and COUNTY INTERACTION COMMITTEE REPORT - JANUARY 25, 2006**

No action items.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

Mr. Carl Sachs, Economic Development Director, reported that the Economic Development Committee had not met for two months due to inclement weather in December and the Lee-Jackson Day holiday in February. He said a meeting was scheduled for February 10 to discuss progress on establishing/creating a technology zone or zones; a labor study in connection with the "Work Where You Live" program; and the creation of an entrepreneurial center at Germanna Community College's Center for Advanced Technology.

Mr. Sachs provided ridership figures for the County Express bus from the Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC). He said since the Board approved PTAC to operate the County bus on a demand basis rather than having fixed routes, ridership had been steadily increasing: 310 riders in October, 322 riders in November, 300 riders in December, and 347 projected riders for January. The bus had averaged 90 to 95 riders per month when operating on a fixed route. He gave the Board a breakdown showing the categories of use. He said Mrs. Clatterbuck, the PTAC Chair, stated that most of the elderly riders were using the bus for shopping and medical reasons.

**AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT - JANUARY 11, 2006**

No action items.

**ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Bossio stated that the only item he had was a report on the Consolidated Services Meeting held November 11, 2005. He asked Mrs. Valerie Lamb, Finance Director, to provide the highlights of that meeting.

Mrs. Lamb reported that the meeting covered the following areas

Finance. The School Board had converted its chart of accounts to the format used by the County. Their financial statements would be on a cost center basis, with all elements

relating to each individual school. The School Board FY 07 budget would be submitted to the County Finance Office on February 13 in the cost center format to be in compliance with the chart of accounts conversion. The only outstanding piece on the Finance portion of Consolidated Services was in the areas of requisition and account payable entry at the individual school level. Dr. Cox indicated that the schools were currently going through an efficiency study with the Governor's Office and he was concerned there may be some overlaps related to the efficiency study and technology study.

Human Resources. The School System recently hired a HR Director, so there had not been any on-going conversation between the two HR Directors, but would continue once the School HR Director was up to speed.

Transportation. The switch has been made from the Wright Express card to Quarles and Mr. Culpeper had been working on some items of concern, but cost savings had already begun to appear.

Procurement. Mr. Culpeper would be working on combining the School's contracts for telephones, cell phones and copiers with the County's as soon as the School's contracts expired.

Mr. Nixon asked what progress was being made in the area of HR between Human Services, the School Board and the County. Mrs. Lamb replied that Human Services was already under the County's umbrella. She said the one outstanding item under HR was cross training so that each HR Department would be able to answer questions about the other's benefits.

Mr. Nixon noted that each school was doing its own data entry for accounts payable and asked whether they were being paid at one location. Mrs. Lamb replied that the schools were turning in all of their requisitions and accounts payable for entry at one location in the Central Office, whereas the County offices were entering them at the Departmental level and were consolidated in the Finance Department. She said there were some connectivity issues between the individual schools and the School's network and they would be addressed by the technology study.

### **CLOSED SESSION**

Mr. Nixon moved to enter into closed session, as permitted under the following *Virginia Code* Sections, and for the following reasons:

1. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(1), to consider: (A) An appointment to the Economic Development Advisory Committee; (B) a resignation from the Rappahannock Emergency

Medical Services Council, and advertisement for that vacancy; (C) appointment of a part-time employee to assist a Department Director; and (D) evaluation of the performance of a particular County Department.

2. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(3) and (A)(7), for discussion with legal counsel and staff regarding the acquisition of privately owned real property interests in the County and probable litigation, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

3. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(7) and (A)(30), for discussion with legal counsel and staff to consider entering into one or more agreements with another public entity, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

4. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(3) and (A)(30), for discussion with legal counsel and staff of the status of negotiations regarding river property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

5. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(7) and (A)(30), for discussion with legal counsel and staff regarding the negotiation of a contract with a specific new private developer, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

6. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(7) and (A)(30), for discussion with legal counsel and staff regarding the negotiation of a contract with a public entity and related probable litigation, where discussion in an open meeting with adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

7. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(7) and (A)(30), for discussion with legal counsel and staff regarding the negotiation of the terms of a potential contract with a specific new private developer for multiple sites, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

Seconded by Mrs. Hansohn.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes – Aylor, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Nay – Chase

Motion carried 6 to 1.

The Board entered into closed session at 3:55 p.m.

The Board returned to open session at 6:08 p.m.



Mr. Coates polled the members of the Board regarding the closed session held. He asked the individual Board members to certify that to the best of their knowledge, did they certify that (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements under Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the closed session motion by which the closed meeting was convened, were heard, discussed or considered by the Board in the closed session.

Mr. Coates asked that the record show Mr. Chase was not present for the closed session.

Ayes – Aylor, Walker, Coates, Nixon, Rosenberger, Hansohn

**RE: RESIGNATION FROM RAPPAHANNOCK EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES COUNCIL**

Mr. Nixon moved to regretfully accept the resignation of Reid Anderson from the Rappahannock Emergency Medical Services Council and advertise to fill the vacancy.

Seconded by Mrs. Hansohn.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes – Aylor, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Absent – Chase

Motion carried 6 to 0.

**RE: LETTER OF DENIAL FOR TAX INCENTIVES TO KOHL'S DEPARTMENT STORES**

Mr. Nixon moved that the Board send a letter under the Chairman's signature to Kohl's Department Stores thanking them for locating in the Town of Culpeper, but declining their request for tax incentives at this time.

Seconded by Mr. Aylor.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes – Aylor, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Absent – Chase

Motion carried 6 to 0.

**RE: WATER AND SEWER CONNECTIONS TO THE CULPEPER COLONNADE PROJECT**

Mr. Nixon moved that the Board send a letter under the Chairman's signature to the Town of Culpeper to request that they supply water and sewer connections to the Culpeper Colonnade Project.

Seconded by Mr. Rosenberger.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes – Aylor, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Absent – Chase

Motion carried 6 to 0.

**RE: JONAS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS**

Mr. Nixon moved to authorize the staff to negotiate for construction easements with the Greens for future improvements to Jonas Road.

Seconded by Mr. Walker.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes – Aylor, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Absent – Chase

Motion carried 6 to 0.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mrs. Hansohn moved to adjourn at 6:10 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Walker

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes – Aylor, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Absent – Chase

Motion carried 6 to 0.

---

Peggy S. Crane, CMC  
Deputy Clerk

---

John F. Coates, Chairman  
Culpeper County Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

---

Frank T. Bossio  
Clerk to the Board

APPROVED: March 7, 2006